

BW401
W3 A6

AN APPENDIX
TO
REMARKS
ON THE
WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION;
BEING
A SUFFICIENT ANSWER
TO THE
REV. JONATHAN CROWTHER'S
AND THE
REV. GEORGE CUBITT'S
Pamphlets on the Subject.

BY SAMUEL WARREN, LL. D.

MANCHESTER: PUBLISHED BY J. E. STOREY, AND SOLD BY ALL OTHER
BOOKSELLERS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

In this Appendix to the Third Edition will be found a few Notes illustrative of some passages in the "Remarks, &c." and corrective of two or three of the most glaring faults in the Pamphlets lately published by the Rev. J. Crowther, and the Rev. George Cubitt, purporting to be "Replies to the Remarks of Dr. Warren."—These brief notes are all that will be necessary to enable the Public rightly to estimate the remarkable productions of those Gentlemen.

The brevity of the Notes above referred to, led the Author to think that so inconsiderable a portion of subject could scarcely be obtruded upon the public notice, with propriety, in a separate form. A polite intimation, however, to the contrary, in one of the Manchester Papers of Saturday last, leads him to adopt the measure recommended, of publishing the Notes separately; and for the reason assigned in that paper. S. W.

Oldham-Street;
Manchester, Nov. 17th, 1831.

Wes. 1432

186

APPENDIX.

A. * The Rev. J. Crowther has, on this expression, hazarded one of the most contemptible quibbles to which any one can have recourse who pretends to candour, in his endeavour to conceal the Rev. Jabez Bunting's insolent language, in stigmatizing my opposition as "UNPRINCIPLED."—That the sense which I have affixed to it, is its common acceptation in the present day, (notwithstanding the pretended qualification of the Gentleman who uttered it) sufficiently appears in Walker's Pronouncing Dictionary,—a work more modern than Dr. Johnson's; and as Mr. Crowther's literature evidently depends so much upon *Dictionary definitions*, he will not probably except against so respectable an authority as that to which I refer him. His words are these: "UNPRINCIPLED.—This word does not mean merely being unsettled in principles or opinions, but *not having*, or being *void of* good principles or opinions. It was in this sense that Dr. Goldsmith called Mr. Wilkes, of seditious and infidel memory, *The unprincipled Impostor*."—The use of the word at all, in the circumstances in which it was uttered, admitted of *no qualification whatever*: nothing short of an instant *retraction* of it could have been deemed a sufficient apology for the offence, by any individual who pretends to honourable or gentlemanly principle. Thus much for Mr. Crowther's *Dictionary-learning*, and the following choice specimen of his attempt at a *metaphysical definition* of the word; as being descriptive of—"a want of *rational*, and not *moral* principle!"

B. * It is dictated to me by my Rev. Opponent, that when Mr. Bunting had charged me, in a mixed Committee, with dishonourable motives, my better course would have been, "to vindicate myself *at once*." To which I reply, that the recollection of a scriptural injunction checked my feelings of instant resentment—"Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath." This may, without offence, I hope, be deemed a safer guide, than the hasty measure proposed to me by the Rev. Jonathan Crowther! Besides, it still seems to me, that the reason assigned for my conduct in my Pamphlet, will be satisfactory to every *christian* mind, viz.—"my adverting to the mixed character of the Meeting, and what was due to the reputation of Ministers of Christ in the presence of their people." To this, however, I may now add, that at the time of this rude outrage and provocation, I had not the least intention of uttering my complaint beyond the precincts of the Conference, nor of uttering it even there, but in self-defence.

C. † On this passage, the *assurance* of Mr. Crowther is astonishing, where he says,—"*Before the reader accepts a charge like this against so many who totally deny it, on the testimony of one—or a few, if more than one there be—who may continue to assert it.*" It is not easy to use temperate language in maintaining a fact the most notorious, against a shameless denial of it! Now it so happened, that the very passage in my speech on which Mr. Crowther has ventured this rash assertion, was one pronounced with more than usual distinctness,—pronounced when silence had been restored, after the "unmannerly uproar" to which I referred had subsided; and in such circumstances that to me it seems almost incredible how any

* See "Remarks," page 9.

† See "Remarks," page 11.

one present could avoid hearing what was said. Mr. Crowther, however, it seems actually did not know what was passing, even at this important moment. Every one present, I will venture to affirm, must have heard what preceded my declaration, when I was refused *by the Chair*, the justice of "vindicating myself and my cause against calumny, before that Assembly;" and that, thus reduced to silence on that subject, the very next topic which followed, was my endeavour to prosecute my argument, in that crippled state, *without the interposition of any other subject whatever.*

With the same utter disregard of accuracy, Mr. Crowther states, that being "interrupted in my attempt to mix up matters of personal crimination and defence with the discussion of that question,—I was informed that my right to defend myself, or to criminate others was not denied;—that the serious charges involved in those remarks must necessarily be a subject of *separate investigation—which investigation I was plainly told I might have, if I thought proper.*" Now, in the first place, the question was *not* one of mere "personal crimination and defence," but one which related chiefly to the Recommendations of the Committee, in respect of the proposed Institution. The value, therefore, of my statements depended almost entirely upon my standing fair in the judgment of my Brethren—upon my coming into court with clean hands. Mr. Bunting had openly impugned my motives, and if I expected to be heard with patience, to say nothing of candour, it was indispensably necessary that I should first endeavour to free myself from the aspersions cast upon me by Mr. Bunting.—But, in the next place, nothing can possibly be stated more *false*, than "*that I was plainly told that I might have a separate investigation if I thought proper.*" No word of the kind was ever uttered in my hearing, nor any reference whatever made to such a subject!

As for the expediency which Mr. C. suggests, in reference to the *time* when he would have had me deliver my unwelcome sentiments, had *he* been consulted: no doubt, both Mr. Bunting, Mr. Crowther, and their friends, could have managed the plan much more agreeably to their feelings, and to their way of thinking. No doubt, had I submitted the whole argument to their arrangement and dictation, the plan, and sentiments, and language would have been most *inoffensive*, and altogether *unobjectionable*. But let Mr. Crowther and his friends know, that however "irregular and disorderly" they may now pronounce my conduct, in attempting to vindicate myself at the moment I did, rather than either "before or after my Speech,"—such a proceeding would have been deemed, and *would really have been*, utterly disorderly! and I should have been called to order, with a witness to it! The reason is this—The injury had been inflicted out of my own District, in a London Committee, just on the eve of Conference. According to rule, no charge could have been brought by me against Mr. Bunting in Conference, but through either his District Meeting, or my own, and after due notice had been given him. This, Mr. Jonathan Crowther ought to have known, is the only regular course I could have taken in bringing a charge against his *Reverend protégé*, when the names of the Preachers were called over. Such a specimen as this argues but little competency in my Opponent to conduct a trial in a Methodistical court; and, consequently, how ill qualified *he* is to give advice to others, on a subject of Methodistical law and order!

D. * It has, strangely enough, been asked in certain quarters, How it came to pass, that though I first concurred with the Committee in the project of a College, I should afterwards have framed a Speech against the necessity of it? My answer is briefly this:—though I did at first bring myself to concur in making the experiment, and could have stated such arguments as seemed to justify it; yet, as soon as I detected the sinister ends sought to be attained by it, the arguments which I had in my mind *against* it gained the preponderance: these, therefore, I afterwards thought proper to bring forward in my Speech, and *not* those which I might otherwise have plausibly advanced in its favour.

E. † On this expression Mr. Crowther has taken the liberty—(though he was not present in the Committee to hear what passed)—to state, what every one who was present, and attentive to the business in hand, must know to be *utterly false*! On the proposal being made, that as Mr. Bunting had been nominated the President of the Institution, the nomination “of all the other officers might be left to himself,” I *immediately* expressed my dissent; and with more than usual warmth. Yet Mr. Crowther, who was not present, has the *assurance* to publish to the world, without a blush, that this proposal met “*with the express concurrence of Dr. Warren himself*!”

THE REV. GEORGE CUBITT, next to the *veracious* Jonathan Crowther, has done me the honour of the most lengthy reply. The principal difference of character in these adventurous performers is, that the former, through inferior scholarship and coarser manners, possesses still less ability than the latter, to ~~conceal~~ the deep mortification felt by him and his party, at the exposure of their sinister designs, under the *pretext* of a better mode of training our junior preachers, to construct an engine for more successfully strengthening a dominant episcopal faction! In one thing they most perfectly coincide—a *culpable disregard of veracity*!—Take one instance: At page 9, third Edition, of the “REMARKS,” I have said, that “I at once stated my dissent from the entire project.” Against this the Rev. George Cubitt has the hardihood to say, “that above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought to give an unevasive reply to this plain question,” i. e. Whether I approved of the modified plan of the Institution.—To which I did *instantly* give what I intended to be, an unequivocal denial; and upon being told that I had not answered satisfactorily, I *immediately* replied, “That nothing was further from my intention than to disguise my sentiments,” and subjoined these words, “*that I dissented in principle from the entire project.*” So far from *truth*, is the Rev. George Cubitt’s statement,—“That I evaded the question for an hour,” that I challenge every one, who was attentive to what passed, to bear witness, in *His* presence, where no falsehood can escape detection, that I did not *for one moment* evade the most explicit answer which I could put into words!—Other statements, equally remote from truth, disgrace almost every page of the REV. GEORGE CUBITT’S vulgar and impudent Pamphlet! The one I have given is a sufficient specimen.

* See “Remarks,” page 15. † See “Remarks,” page 25.